

REMARKS:

Claims 1-9, 12-19 and 22 are currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley in view of various combinations of Hochestein, Hartley, Koehler and Kamakura.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley in view of various combinations of Hochestein, Hartley, Koehler and Kamakura, in further view of Parker.

Claims 5, 7, 14 and 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley in view of various combinations of Hochestein, Hartley, Koehler and Kamakura, in further view of Kish.

No claims were allowed.

REGARDING ALL OF EXAMINER'S §103 OBJECTIONS:

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence, such as commercial success, long felt need in the art and failure of others, indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Applicant submits that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

Applicant has combined most of the relevant restrictions found in the claims into claims 1, 12, and 22. Applicant is also submitting evidence of commercial success that Assignee CAO Group, Inc. has experienced in marketing this invention. (See, Affidavit of Densen Cao, CEO of CAO Group, Inc.). Applicant therefore requests Examiner to consider this evidence, combined with the fact that Examiner is combining up to 6 different references to reject these claims and the claims still dependent upon them. Applicant is of the belief that, when all the factors are considered, Examiner will find that the combinations suggested are not as obvious as Examiner once believed and will enter the Amendments proposed and pass the case for issue.

Applicant submits that Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 12, 17-19 and 22, if the Amendment is entered, would be allowable over the prior art and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these Claims and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 4, 2007

/GEDobbinEsq/

Geoffrey E. Dobbin
Patent Attorney, # 42,490
4278 S 6220 W
West Valley City, UT 84124-6501
(801) 969-6609 (voice)
(801) 349-2453 (fax)
9:00 am – 5:00 pm Mountain Time